



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,913	03/02/2004	Elliot M. Choi	END920040013US1	1411
30449	7590	02/20/2007	EXAMINER	
SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS 22 CENTURY HILL DRIVE SUITE 302 LATHAM, NY 12110			WEI, ZHENG	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2192		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	02/20/2007	PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/790,913	CHOI ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Zheng Wei	2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 3-9, 12-18 and 21-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 3-9, 12-18 and 21-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 November 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Remarks***

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 11/22/2006
2. The 35 U.S.C 101 rejections to claims 1-9 and 19-27 are withdrawn as the Applicant canceled and amended the claims.
3. The 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejections of claims 3, 5, 14, 21 and 23 are withdrawn upon in view of the Applicant's arguments.
4. The 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejections of claims 3, 5, 12, 14, 21 and 23 are withdrawn upon in view of the Applicant's arguments.
5. The objection to the drawings is withdrawn as the Applicant amended the drawings.
6. The objection to the specification is withdrawn as the Applicant amended the specification.
7. Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 19 and 20 have been canceled.
8. Claims 3-6, 8-9, 12, 14-15 17-18, 21, 23-24 and 26-27 have been amended
9. Claims 3-8, 12-18 and 21-27 remain pending and have been examined

***Claim Objections***

10. Claim 20 is objected to because of the following informalities:  
Claims 20 has been canceled by Applicant, but it is still marked "Original" at page
11. It should be deleted or crossed over. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 8-9, 17-18 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 8, 17 and 26: The trademarks "Java" are used in a claims as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claims do not comply with the requirements of the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Ex parte Simpson, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. To expedite correction on this matter, the Examiner suggests amend the term "Java software" to -- "JAVA software" –

Claims 9, 18 and 27: The term "WSP server" has to be defined in the claim to properly identify any particular material or product. The Examiner suggests adding definition of WSP to the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3-9, 12-18 and 21-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanis (Hanis et al., "Applying the State Pattern to WebSphere Portal Portlets", Part 1- Overview, Part2 – Implementation, 12/11/2002) in view of Jacobson (Jacobson et al., Object-Oriented Software Engineering, A User Case Driven Approach. –Art is now being made of record.)

Claim 3:

Hanis discloses a method for designing object-oriented software for implementing portlets of a portal, said portlets adapted to be available to a user of the software during a session in which the user clicks on a link of a first page to identify an action object of an Action class and a state object of a State class, said method comprising:

- designing the software followed by storing the designed software in a computer usable medium from which the software may be executed on a processor of a computer system to implement portlets of a portal, said designing the software comprising:
  - including in the software a Portlet Template that comprises the State class, the Action class, and program code (Part 1, page 2, "StatemanagerPortlet", "action" and "State");
  - including in the State class a perform view method for displaying a view of a page (Part 1, pages 2-3, "Typically, the state's perform method will

invoke a JSP to render its results.", also see page 5, "A state is a class that implements the state interface and represents the effect of the portlet as a result of applying an action. This class typically has a visual component.");

- including in the Action class an action performed method for performing an action and a set state method for setting the state object into the session (Part 1, page 2, "Classes that implement this interface will implement an actionPerformed method. ", "This method also sets the current state for further processing. In this flow process, an action gets called, it performs work specific to its function, and then sets the state for the next transition.");
- adapting the program code to execute (Part 1, page 2, "StateManagerProtlet...The class serves as a dispatcher to support action and state classes where the portlet code resides."
  - (a) the action performed method of the action object to perform the action,
  - (b) the set state method of the action object to set the state object into the session and
  - (c) the perform view method of the state object to display a view of a second page that is associated with the action;
- including a portlet code module and a controller code module in the program code, wherein the portlet code module is adapted to execute the action performed method and the set state method, and wherein the

controller code module is adapted to execute the perform view method (Part1, page 7, "The code below shows the simple processing in the actionPerformed method of the StateManageProtlet class. Again, this method simply gets the current action class instance and invokes its actionPerformed method.", Part 1, page 7, "Before the state class is asked by the StateMangerProtlet to write an HTML fragment to the response, the StateManagerPortlet can ask the state class calls to refresh it");

- Hanis also discloses the portlet code module includes a StateManagerProtlet class (part 1, page 2, "StateMangerPortlet") which has an actionPerformed method. (Part 1, page 2, "StateMangerPortlet implements the actionPerformed method...")

but does not explicitly discloses StateManagerProtlet class can be implemented as base-child class architecture wherein generic methods can be defined in base class and the portlet specific methods can be defined in extended child class.

However, Jacobson in the same analogous art of Object-Oriented software engineering discloses the basic feature of object-oriented programming – Inheritance (see for example, Fig.3.14 and related text, also see p.58, lines 19-25, "By means of extracting and sharing common characteristics, we can generalize classes and place them higher up in an inheritance hierarchy. In the same way, if we wish to add a new class, we can find a class that already offers some of the operations and information structure required for the new

class. We can then let the new class inherit this class and only add anything which is unique for the new class. We then specialize the class").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use this inheritance feature to define generic and common features of StateManagerProtlet class in a base class (for example, Baseportlet class) and to define specific feature (for example, Templateportlet class with porlet specific method) in the child class of the base class. In this way, base class can be reused to derive and generate different specific classes. One would have been motivated to use inheritance feature to reuse common description and make it very easy to modify the code as suggested by Jacobson (see for example, p.57, line 9-10, "Hence we can reuse common descriptions", also see p.58, lines 7-8, "Hence inheritance is very useful for easy modification of models")

Claim 4:

Hanis and Jacobson disclose the method of claim 3 and Hanis further discloses wherein said designing the software further comprises including an action listener method in the BasePortlet class, wherein the action object resulting from the user clicking on the link of the first page is communicated from the portal to the action listener method (see for example, Part 1, pages 4, part 2, pages 6-7, implementation examples).

Claim 5:

Hanis and Jacobson discloses the method of claim 3 and Hanis further discloses wherein said designing the software further comprises including a BaseController class and a TemplateControllerForHtml class in the controller code module, wherein the BaseController class does not include a portlet specific method and includes the performView method, and wherein the TemplateControllerForHtml class is a child of the BaseController class and includes at least one portlet specific method (see for example, Part1, page 2, "StatemanagerProtlet implements the actionPerformed method and the doView, doEdit, doHelp, and doConfigure methods.").

Claim 6:

Hanis and Jacobson disclose the method of claim 3 and Hanis and Jacobson disclose the method of claim 3 wherein a first object of the State class includes a first performView method for displaying a first portlet state of a given page, wherein a second object of the State class includes a second performView method for displaying a second portlet state of the given page, and wherein the first and second portlet states are different portlet states (Part1, page 2, "Typically, the state's perform method will invoke a JSP to render its results", part2, page 14-15, section "Wrapping up the portlet states and actions")

Claim 8:

Hanis and Jacobson disclose the method of claim 3 and Hanis further discloses the method of claim 3 wherein the software comprises Java software (Part 1, page 3, example of implementation using Java. The example code uses a keyword "throws", last line at page 3. This is a JAVA specific keyword. For the C++ programming language the similar keyword is "throw". Therefore, it is JAVA example code).

Claim 9:

Hanis and Jacobson disclose the method of claim 3 and Hanis further discloses the method of claim 3 wherein the portal comprises a WSP server (see for example, Part1, page 1, "IBM ® WebSphere® Portal (hereafter called Portal)")

Claims 12-15 and 17-18:

Claims 12-15 and 17-18 are system version for performing the claimed method as in claims 3-6 and 8-9 addressed above, wherein all claimed limitation functions have been addressed and/or set forth above and certainly a computer system would need to run and/or practice such function steps disclosed by reference above. Thus, they also would have been obvious.

Claims 21-24 and 26-27:

Claims 21-24 and 26-27 are computer program products version of the claimed method, wherein all claimed limitation functions have been addressed in claims

3-6 and 8-9 above respectively. It is well known in the computer art that such method steps can be implemented as computer program and can be practiced and /or stored on a computer operable media. Thus, they also would have been obvious in view of reference teachings above.

5. Claims 7, 16 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanis (Hanis et al., "Applying the State Pattern to WebSphere Portal Portlets", Part 1- Overview, Part2 – Implementation, 12/11/2002) in view of Jacobson (Jacobson et al., Object-Oriented Software Engineering, A User Case Driven Approach) in further view of Hepper (Hepper et al., "Introducing the Portlet Specification, Part 1", 08/01/2003)

Claim 7: Hanis and Jacobson disclose the method as in claim 6 above, but do not explicitly disclose that the portlet states are selected from the group consisting of a Normal portlet state, a Maximized portlet state, and a Minimized portlet state. However, Hepper discloses that the Portlet Specification – JSR 168 defines the following window states: Normal, Maximized and Minimized. (Pages 5-6, Window states). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement those three Portlet Specification defined states. One would have been motivated and required to implement Normal, Maximized and Minimized state defined by the Portlet Specification, because, these are required features in JSR 168 according to Hepper.

**Claim 16:**

Claim 16 is a system version for performing the claimed method as in claim 7 addressed above, wherein all claimed limitation functions have been addressed and/or set forth above and certainly a computer system would need to run and/or practice such function steps disclosed by reference above. Thus, it also would have been obvious.

**Claim 25:**

Claim 25 is a computer program product version of the claimed method, wherein all claimed limitation functions have been addressed in claim 7 above respectively. It is well known in the computer art that such method steps can be implemented as computer program and can be practiced and /or stored on a computer operable media. Thus, it also would have been obvious in view of reference teachings above.

***Conclusion***

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

12. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. As prior art discloses such newly amended limitations as applied above.
13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zheng Wei whose telephone number is (571) 270-1059. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:00-15:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is 571- 272-1000.



TUAN Q. DAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER